

PATENT**REMARKS**

Claims 9-16, 18-19, 21-22, and 28-31 are pending in the present application.

In the above amendments, claims 9-11, 16, 18-19, 21-22 and 28-31 have been amended, and claims 1-8, 17, 20, and 23-27 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 28-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 28-31 complies with the written description requirement, and the Examiner's attention is drawn to e.g., paragraphs 1074 – 1080 of the specification.

In particular, with respect to claims 28 and 30, the Examiner's attention is drawn to paragraph number 1077 which discloses that in one embodiment, the "base station decodes the full C/I value on the re-synch subchannel ... If the base station then receives any up bits" This portion of the specification, for example, provides a written description of the "multiplexing" limitation recited in claims 28 and 30.

With respect to claims 29 and 31, the Examiner's attention is drawn to paragraph number 1078 which discloses that in another embodiment, the "base station decodes the full C/I value on the re-synch subchannel ... If the base station then receives any down bits" This portion of the specification, for example, provides a written description of the "multiplexing" limitation recited in claims 29 and 31.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 9-12, 16, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Olofsson et al (Olofsson).

With respect to independent claim 9, it is respectfully submitted that Olofsson does not teach nor suggest the claimed feature "a transmitter for transmitting the full channel quality value and the plurality of incremental values over multiple slots in a frame, wherein the plurality of incremental values are discarded by the base station" as now claimed.

Attorney Docket No.: 020248

Customer No.: 23696

PATENT

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 16, it is respectfully submitted that Olofsson does not teach nor suggest the claimed feature "transmitting the full channel quality value and the plurality of incremental values over multiple slots in a frame, wherein the plurality of incremental values are discarded by the base station" as now claimed.

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 21, it is respectfully submitted that Olofsson does not teach nor suggest the claimed feature "means for transmitting the full channel quality value and the plurality of incremental values over multiple slots in a frame, wherein the plurality of incremental values are discarded by the base station" as now claimed.

Claims 28 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lundby et al (Lundby).

With respect to claims 28 and 30, it is respectfully submitted that Lundby does not teach nor suggest the claimed feature "determining said full channel quality value exceeds a fixed maximum value represented by a finite number of data bits" (emphasis added) as now claimed.

With respect to claims 29 and 31, it is respectfully submitted that Lundby does not teach nor suggest the claimed feature "determining said full channel quality value is below a fixed minimum value represented by a finite number of data bits" (emphasis added) as now claimed.

In contrast, Lundby teaches in Fig. 3B that the PROJ_C_I value, which the Examiner equates with a maximum or minimum value, is not fixed but rather is adjusted, see step 310 which states "ADJUST PROJ_C_I BASED ON COMPARISION."

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 13 –15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olofsson et al., in view of Gilhousen et al.(Gilhousen).

Claim 17 has been canceled, and therefore its rejection is deemed moot. Claims 13-15 and 18-19 are deemed allowable at least for the reasons given above with respect to their respective parent claims, from which they either directly or indirectly depend.

PATENT**REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 29, 2005By: W. Chris Kim
W. Chris Kim, Reg. No. 40,457
(858) 651 - 6295

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

Attorney Docket No.: 020248
Customer No.: 23696